Manufacturing of Cine Colour Positive film by HPF Co. Ltd.

517. SHRI A. NALLASIVAN:
SHRI V. GOPALSAMY:
SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Hindustan Photo Film Manufacturing Compainy Limited has a proposal for manufacture of cine colour positive film at Udagamandalam, Tamil Nadu;

(b) whether that company had obtained a letter of intent in 1981 itself;

(c) whether the Central Government have cleared the project;

(d) if not, the reason thereof; and

(e) whether Government proposes to clear the project?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (SHRI P. K. THUNGON): (a) and (b) Yes, Sir

(c) to (e) The Eighth Plan proposals are yet to be finalised.

Termination of verdict society project by Capart

518. SHRI A. NALLASIVAN: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a Social Organisation known as VERDICT SOCIETY, Calcutta was sanctioned a project through CAPART with amount sanctioned on 8th January, 1988;

(b) whether it is also a fact that the instalments of the sanctioned amount was sanctioned late, the said social organisation suffered loss by way of spoiling of medicinal plants, extracts powder etc.;

(c) whether it is also a fact that CAPART (Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural Technology) suddenly terminated the project on 25th April, 1990;

(d) whether the VERDICT SOCIETY bad spent money on their own for the project for the period from August, 1989 to April, 1990 i.e. till the termination order;

(e) whether VERDICT SOCIETY had urged Government to sanction fund for the above-mentioned period to enable them to pay off the loans; and

(f) whether Government is sympathetically considering their request in view of the circumstances they had explained?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI UTTAMBHAI ft PATEL): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) CAPART released 1st instalment to the Society after it accepted the terms and conditions on 13.1.88. CAPART releases the subsequent instalments only after receipt and due examination of progress reports and statement of expen diture incurred for the amounts already released and monitoring the progress made duing implementation of project. In this case the 1st progress report was receied after eight months delay. After due examination jhere-of and obtaining the necessary clarifications, the 2nd in stalment was released on 15th June, 1989. No information relating to spoilage of medicinal plants was received by CAPART till that time.

(c) No, Sir, CAPART got the project evaluated by a technical monitor in October, 1989 and based on his report which highlighted many deficiencies in the implementation of the project, CAPART decided to terminate it.

(d) This was represented to Government by the Verdict Society.

(e) The society had in their letter of 18th December, 1989 approached the Government stating that if the project was proposed to be continued, Rs. 2,95,800/- should be released in a lumpsum, and if it was decided to wind up the project, they should be released